



Occidental Square Structure Kiosk Replacement Project

PUBLIC MEETING # 2

Wednesday, May 2, 2007 6:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.
Grand Central Lobby

Present: OTAK Architects, Penny Mabie, Facilitator, Patrick Donohue, Project Manager for Seattle Parks and Recreation, Karen O'Connor, Public Information Officer for Seattle Parks and Recreation and public attendees.

Meeting: Facilitator Intro

- Introduction of OTAK and Parks
- Purpose of the meeting – to get public input on the kiosk
- Presented rules and agenda

Public Comment:

- Why are we meeting? We don't need to discuss this because of the appeal.

Facilitator moved meeting forward reiterating that the City has said to move forward on the kiosk.

OTAK presented drawing:

- Drawings look hard line
- These are just a couple ideas to solicit comments
- Public Input addressing drawings
 - Assumption that the design would include shelter/pergola
 - there is no reflection or hint of shelter/pergola in the design
 - why is the public suppose to believe in the process
 - there has been no respect of the process in the past if we are supposedly moving forward
- Peter – request that we focus this meeting on the kiosk and on the design. They were given different design elements, size, and parameters of kiosk
 - trying to incorporate the shelter/pergola was not part of the assignment
- Yen started presenting and was interrupted

Facilitator put presentation back on track

OTAK – Continued presentation

- First Theme
 - We want to bring more people into the park
 - First design has separate bays
 - Historical groves
 - Open space –possibly for gallery shows
- Second Theme – more modern
 - Different areas dedicated to different things
 - Small – looks like it is closer to the ground
 - Concession space in front on one side
 - Ticket booth or info booth

Parks said that original elevator car is owned by community and needs to be relocated.

The plan is to enclose the power panel

Curtis – Landscape Architect from OTAK said this building had to meet many considerations

- No back of house
- Front on all sides
- Give park storage
- Easy recognizable
- Something that fits in

Public Comment:

- Discard the two concepts and reuse the shelter / parts of pergola

Craig Montgomery of the Preservation Board spoke –

This does not meet the condition of what was passed – need to look into Conditions of approval. ' Conditions of Approval – seems these are not being met.

- Public comment that both designs have no sustainability incorporated and it looks like no thoughts were put in this direction

OTAK commented that this came up quite a bit in planning project but because it is such a small

Public Comments:

- Difficult to be in meeting when legal matter still on the floor
- Removal of trees comment –

Facilitator brought meeting back to kiosk

Public Comment:

- that the designs are disappointing – looking for design that was stronger more joyful – bold design
- Reminds public of garage – gas station

OTAK – we studied what other cities were doing

Public Comment:

- Would like building that captures your eye – bring you to the building
- Building itself would be a draw, it does not need to look historical. Community groups against foe – historical. Wants something that captures your eyes and draws you just based on the building itself – or a destination building
- Wants something that captures your eyes and draws you just based on the building or a destination building
- Will the building be a shelter at all? A place to be protected from rain
Design with restroom that a retiree could monitor
- What is the cost involved?

Parks answered \$300,000 design and construction

Public Comment:

- Has any shelter been considered? Maybe space should be more flex – to protect people from the elements has any accommodations been made for people displaced by park renovation – a shelter to bring people out of the rain?

- Build a less expensive bldg and use money to address needs of people displaced by park renovation.

Parks – The use of the building has not been determined. There is no intended tenant.

Public Comment:

- Will Police have access to the building?

Parks – It has been discussed that the building would be accessible for Park ranger but again depends on the future use.

Public Comment:

- It is an embarrassment to be at a public meeting when the shelter/ pergola was taken down illegally and.....
- How is Parks going to use the shelter/ pergola and or reuse it?
- Is the building going to be a revenue generating or self sustaining? Is this another example of commercialization / privatization of park?
- Will this be a budget-positive long-term proposition?

Facilitator -

Thanked everyone for coming.